



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

917 Lakeridge Way • PO Box 43430 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3430 • (360) 753-7800 • TDD (360) 753-7809

**PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA**

*Washington State University, Compton Union Bldg., Junior Ballroom  
Grimes Way, Pullman, Washington 99164  
September 12, 2001*

*Approximate  
Times*

*Tab*

**8:15 a.m.**     BOARD BREAKFAST AND MEETING OVERVIEW (Holiday Inn)  
*No official business will be conducted.*

**9:00 a.m.**     **Welcome and Introductions**

- Bob Craves, HECB Chair
- Pres. V. Lane Rawlins, Washington State University

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

**Adoption of July 2001 HECB Meeting Minutes** **1**

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- **Status Report: Notification of Intent (new public baccalaureate degree programs)** **2**

PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

- **Guidelines for Accountability Report** **3**  
HECB staff briefing  
(Resolution 01-30)
- **Review of Degree-granting Institutions Act** **4**  
HECB staff briefing

**10:15 a.m.**     B R E A K

**10:30 a.m.**     **Teacher Training Pilot Projects** **5**  
HECB staff briefing  
(Resolution 01-31)

## Updates on HECB Programs and Projects

HECB staff briefing

- **Financial Aid Programs, State Need Grant** 6
- **K-16 Roundtable** 7

**11:30 p.m.**     **WSU Student Panel**

12:00 noon     **LUNCHEON WITH WSU REGENTS AND ADMINISTRATORS**  
*No official business will be conducted.*

**1:30 p.m.**     **Washington State University Presentation** 8  
Pres. V. Lane Rawlins

## PUBLIC COMMENT

**2:30 p.m.**     **ADJOURNMENT**

*If you are a person with disability and require an accommodation for attendance, or need this agenda in an alternative format, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7800 as soon as possible to allow us sufficient time to make arrangements. We also can be reached through our Telecommunication Device for the Deaf at (360) 753-7809.*

*Sept. 11, 4:30-8:00 p.m.     Tour of WSU campus, then dinner at the home of Pres. Rawlins.  
No official business will be conducted.*

## 2001 HECB Meeting Calendar

<i>Date</i>	<i>TENTATIVE LOCATION</i>
October 30 Tuesday	Cascadia Community College, Bothell
December 12 Wednesday	Gonzaga University, Spokane Foley Library Teleconference Room

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### July 25, 2001

September 2001

#### HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair  
Dr. Gay Selby, Vice Chair  
Mr. Jim Faulstich  
Mr. Larry Hanson  
Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins  
Mr. Herb Simon  
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn  
Ms. Pat Stanford

#### Welcome and Introductions

HECB Chairman Bob Craves opened the meeting at 9:45 a.m. and started the round of Board introductions. Chancellor Vicky Carwein welcomed the Board to the University of Washington Tacoma campus. She spoke about the continuing growth of UWT, estimated to be about 15.5 percent per year, and the projected establishment of the technology institute.

**Rep. Pat Lantz**, who represents the district and attended the meeting, was invited to say a few words. She expressed pride in the teamwork and partnerships among business, community members, and the UWT that has successfully leveraged funding for the technology institute.

#### Minutes of May Board Meeting Approved

*ACTION: **Pat Stanford** moved for consideration of the **minutes of the Board's May meeting**, and the notes from the **joint work session** with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. **Larry Hanson** seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.*

#### New Degree Program Approved

*ACTION: **Gay Selby** moved for consideration of three resolutions under the consent agenda, recommending approval of new degree programs for the University of Washington: **Res. 01-26, BS in Neurobiology; Res. 01-27, MS in Information Systems; and Res. 01-28, MS in Architecture**. **Jim Faulstich** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.*

**Director's Report**

Executive Director Marc Gaspard summarized the agenda for the day, and offered update reports on ongoing programs and projects: reciprocity agreements, Washington Promise Scholarship, the GEAR UP summer institutes, the GET college savings plan.

In addition, Mr. Gaspard provided a status report on three programs approved under the Notification of Intent (NOI) process. Among changes in the HECB's guidelines for program approvals adopted in January 2001, is a new program review and approval process for existing degree programs proposed at branch campuses, new off-campus locations, via distance learning, or through a combination of delivery methods. The process requires institutions to submit a Notification of Intent at least 45 days prior to the proposed start date of the program. The NOI is published on the HECB Web site, and if the Board receives no objections, the executive director approves the programs. Three such programs have been approved since January 2001: M.Ed. Master Teacher, CWU; BA Education/Elementary, CWU; and MS Applied Math, UW.

Finally, Mr. Gaspard expressed appreciation to the Legislature for its confirmation of HECB members Herb Simon, Pat Stanford, Chang Mook Sohn, and Gay Selby.

**Legislative Update**

HECB Government Relations Director Bruce Botka provided highlights on major HECB priorities, including final enrollment and budget numbers. He said the budget allows 55 percent income cut-off for State Need Grant; and although legislation for the Promise Scholarship was not approved, the top 15 percent cut-off for students was preserved.

Comments and questions from board members indicated a need for the Policy Committee to identify — and make available — various data that would help the Board in its policy deliberations.

Related to HECB legislative priorities, Ruta Fanning, HECB deputy director, referred to the HECB projects summary. Projects are divided into four categories, describing whether a project is required under statute, legislative mandate, Board resolution, or administrative need. The projects are listed by due dates, not by priority. She clarified that the projects do not include the day-to-day operations requirements of the agency.

**UWT Technology Institute**

Board member Herb Simon provided introductory comments. He ascribed the rapid development of the project to the inspired work and dedication of UWT Chancellor Vicky Carwein and Bill Philip, UWT advisory board chair.

Chancellor Carwein traced the beginnings of the project to Gov. Gary Locke who envisioned the institute as a response to the shortage of high-tech workers in the area. She introduced the members of the panel, composed of individuals representing various groups involved with the technology institute.

- Rich Nafziger, former policy advisor to Gov. Locke, described the situation that gave rise to the Governor's idea of a technology center.
- Ken Myer, workforce chair of the Washington Software Alliance (WSA), shared the latest workforce survey results conducted by WSA, which clearly shows the rising and continuing need for baccalaureate-trained high-tech workers.
- Bill Philip described how the business community rallied to bring the UW to Tacoma and how business has come to the forefront in support of the technology center.
- David Notkin, Boeing professor and associate chair for Computer Science and Engineering at the UW Seattle, and Larry Crum, UWT director of Computing and Software Systems, talked about the need for the two campuses to work together and described technology academic plans.
- State Board for Community and Technical Colleges Director for Education Services Jan Yoshiwara talked about how community colleges provide students for the pipeline and about the collaborations underway to ease transfer and articulation from the two-year colleges to the baccalaureate institutions.
- Susan Hasse, UWT senior student of computer programming, shared some of her experiences and career goals.

The recurring theme was the need for continuing collaborations and partnerships to create more opportunities and financial help for students and institutions. Bill Philip suggested it is time to look at changing the funding strategy for higher education. Herb Simon called for a more concerted effort statewide to get the private sector to invest in higher education.

### **The Evergreen State College Tacoma Campus**

Evergreen State College Tacoma Campus Director Joye Hardiman described the student population, programs of study, and successes of the campus. She clarified that TESC Tacoma is an off-campus site, not a branch campus. The campus is nationally known for graduating people of color, with a graduation rate never lower than 89 percent. Student success is attributed to student (and parents) involvement in the community, strong focus on the application of learning, articulation agreements and co-location with two-year colleges, and intergenerational transfers.

### **Distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, Consortial Degree Program**

Policy Committee Chair Gay Selby provided background information, and Associate Director Elaine Jones described the program and the committee's recommendations.

In July 1998, the HECB conditionally approved WSU's distance-delivered bachelor's degree in Business Administration with the understanding that the consortium of public four-year institutions would deliver a "consortial-awarded" BA in Business Administration by July 1, 2001. But because of problems with accreditation and limited funding, the consortium has requested that each institution be permanently approved by the HECB to deliver its own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration.

The Policy Committee recommended extending WSU's conditional approval for two more years, after which it would automatically be made permanent. Other universities in the consortium

(CWU, EWU, WWU) are to be granted conditional approval for their own individual programs as long as certain conditions are met in the next two years.

WSU Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Jane Sherman and EWU Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies Ron Dalla expressed support for the program.

***ACTION: Gay Selby** moved for consideration of **Resolution 01-29**, approving the Policy Committee's recommendations on the Distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, Consortial Degree Program. **Larry Hanson** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.*

### **Transfer and Articulation Policies Review**

HECB Associate Director Gary Benson summarized the report, which lays out the preliminary scope, process, and timeline for a study surrounding transfer and articulation. He emphasized that the preliminary study scope will be reviewed and refined through a collaborative process involving representatives of the public colleges and universities, the independent institutions, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and the Council of Presidents.

Jim Faulstich suggested that rather than a study group, an “action” group on transfer and articulation be established.

### **2003-05 Budget Guidelines**

Marc Gaspard reminded the Board that statute requires the HECB to issue budget guidelines to the institutions by December of odd-numbered years, which means staff would need to start working with the institutions now.

Fiscal Committee Chair Larry Hanson remarked that the approach being considered for the 2003-05 budget guidelines is different than in previous years, particularly with regards to the operating budgets. In essence, the approach would first direct institutions to articulate the “basics” of what they need in any biennium to preserve the system. Then they would identify a limited number of system-wide initiatives that merit additional resources in the upcoming biennium. With respect to the capital budget, the Committee proposes continuing with the approach of system-wide integrated rankings of capital projects.

Ruta Fanning, HECB deputy director, and Associate Directors John Fricke and Jim Reed discussed the specifics of the budget guidelines. They also described the collaborative process to be used in putting the process forward.

Bob Craves inquired about what other states are doing to finance higher education. Jim Reed said that the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and the Joint Legislative Accountability Review Committee (JLARC), in consultation with the HECB, had been directed by the Legislature to conduct a study of higher education capital and facility needs. In connection with

this study, the HECB is looking at how other states have addressed this issue, such as North Carolina's capital improvement bond referendum.

Ann Ramsay-Jenkins proposed that in preparation for the next Master Plan, staff should look into which of the current master plan initiatives have not been met, the reasons why, and the cost of delays or consequences of deferral. She suggested that if the reason for the delay is the budget, then different funding mechanisms should be considered.

### **UWT Student Panel**

Chancellor Vicky Carwein introduced four students who shared some of their thoughts about working on their degrees at a branch campus and their reasons for picking the UWT. Two of the students mentioned that transfer from a community college to the UWT was greatly facilitated by staff from the colleges who are knowledgeable about transfer requirements and core programs they needed to successfully transition to the UWT. The students who participated in the panel are: Burke Anderson, Erica Escobar, Barry Nelson, and Shellie Jo White.

### **Latino/a Educational Achievement Project**

Concerned that Latino students have scored very low on virtually all K-12 state assessments in the past 20 years, a group of Washington citizens initiated the Latino/a Educational Achievement Project (LEAP) to improve learning opportunities and academic achievement of Latino students.

LEAP Chair and Skagit Valley College President Lydia Ledesma-Reese stated that other groups have addressed these same concerns in the past, but Latino students continue to score low. LEAP believes that all children – not just Latinos – can meet high academic standards when they are provided appropriate and supportive learning environments. She described the current projects that LEAP is working on, including proposals to develop public policies that will open college doors to undocumented students, dual language educators, and parent literacy and school involvement training.

Ricardo Sanchez, LEAP director, discussed demographics. He said OFM predicts that the Latino population will be the fastest growing group by 2020; consequently, the student population will reflect the same demographics. LEAP recommends the state rethink some of its policies to help this sector.

One way LEAP brings its issues to a larger audience is through public dialogues. One such meeting is planned for September 29, and the HECB has been invited to participate. Chair Bob Craves asked Marc Gaspard to see if staff can get involved with the project.

### **Adjournment**

After a short executive session, the Board adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

**RESOLUTION NO. 01-26**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington has requested approval to establish a Bachelor of Science in Neurobiology; and

WHEREAS, The program will enhance the university's undergraduate offerings in science and attract highly qualified students from diverse backgrounds; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the quality of the program and outstanding faculty; and

WHEREAS, The program will serve as a model collaborative program between the Medical School and the College of Arts and Sciences; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable for a program of this nature;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Neurobiology, effective July 25, 2001.

Adopted:

July 25, 2001

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair



**RESOLUTION NO. 01-27**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington has requested approval to establish a Master of Science in Information Systems; and

WHEREAS, The program will address the immediate and future need for information systems professionals; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the high quality of the curriculum and affiliated faculty; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are suitable for a program of this nature; and

WHEREAS, The program will be funded on a self-sustaining basis;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Master of Science in Information Systems, beginning fall 2001.

Adopted:

July 25, 2001

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

**RESOLUTION NO. 01-28**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington proposes to establish a Master of Science in Architecture, beginning in fall 2001; and

WHEREAS, The program will introduce advanced studies in architecture and serve the growing needs of the profession well; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the need and quality of the program and its faculty; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans will serve students and the program well; and

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington's proposal to establish a Master of Science in Architecture, beginning in fall 2001, effective July 25, 2001.

Adopted:

July 25, 2001

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

## **RESOLUTION NO. 01-29**

WHEREAS, The Consortium of Public Baccalaureate Institutions of the State of Washington for the Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration was established to develop and deliver a "consortium-awarded" BA in Business Administration; and

WHEREAS, The Consortium has concluded that because of insurmountable accreditation issues and costs associated with administrative overhead, the concept of a state-based consortium-awarded BA in Business Administration is an unworkable one for the foreseeable future; and

WHEREAS, All participating Consortium members continue to support the social efficiency issues that are inherent in the consortium concept, and propose that each member should award its own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration in keeping with the program guidelines and goals they have established; and

WHEREAS, The Board recognizes that WSU's conditionally approved distance delivered BA in Business Administration has contributed significantly to greater higher education access in all regions of Washington; and

WHEREAS, The Board recognizes that the consortium has made impressive progress in developing program guidelines and goals, and additional tasks remain;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby:

1. Extends WSU's conditional approval to offer its distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, in keeping with the Consortium's collaborative program guidelines and goals, through June 30, 2003. This conditional approval will automatically convert to permanent approval on July 1, 2003.

2. Grants conditional approval to the other institutional members of the Consortium (CWU, EWU, WWU) to offer their own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, in keeping with the Consortium's collaborative program guidelines and goals, pending the July 1, 2002 completion and HECB approval of each institution's program delivery plan for initiating their own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration by June 30, 2003. The program delivery plan shall include:

- a) name of institution
- b) degree title
- c) program implementation date
- d) source and amount of funding
- e) year 1 and full enrollment targets
- f) timetable for developing and delivering on-line courses and options;
- g) inventory of on-line courses and options to be offered;
- h) identification of resources and funds dedicated to support the program;
- i) timetable for continued development of a joint transfer guide, on-line catalog, and marketing plan.

Those institutions gaining conditional approval and implementing their program by June 30, 2001 will automatically be granted permanent approval on July 1, 2003.

3. Stipulates that in the event an institutional member of the Consortium fails to complete and/or gain HECB approval for its program delivery plan by July 1, 2002 for initiating its own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration by June 30, 2003, conditional approval lapses. At a later date, if the institution wants to offer a distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, it shall submit a Notification of Intent to the HECB for consideration.

4. Stipulates that in the event other public baccalaureate institutions want to offer a distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, they shall submit a Notification of Intent to the HECB for consideration.

Adopted:

July 25, 2001

Attest:

---

Bob Craves, Chair

---

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

## **STATUS REPORT Notification of Intent**

September 2001

### **INTRODUCTION**

In January 2001 the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted revised *Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval and Review* in order to expedite and improve the process for the institutions and HECB alike. One of the major changes in the *Guidelines* includes a new program review and approval process for existing degree programs proposed to be offered at a branch campus, a new off-campus location, via distance learning technologies, or a combination of delivery methods.

The process requires an institution to submit a Notification of Intent (NOI) in electronic format to the HECB at least 45 days prior to the proposed start date of the program. The NOI includes the following information:

- Name of institution
- Degree title
- Delivery mechanism
- Location
- Implementation date
- Substantive statement of need
- Source of funding
- Year 1 and full enrollment targets (FTE and headcount)

HECB staff posts the institution's NOI on the HECB Web site within 5 business days of receipt, and via email notifies the provosts of the other public four-year institutions, the Washington Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the Inter-institutional Committee on Academic Program Planning, and the Council of Presidents. The other public four-year institutions and HECB staff have 30 days to review and comment on the NOI via an email link on the HECB Web site.

If there are no objections, the HECB Executive Director approves the existing degree program proposed to be offered at a branch campus, a new off-campus location, via distance learning technologies, or a combination of delivery methods. If there is controversy, the HECB will employ its dispute resolution process.

## STATUS REPORT

From July 6, 2001 through August 31, 2001, the HECB Executive Director has approved the following existing degree programs in accordance with the NOI process.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Degree Title</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
UW Tacoma	BA Social Welfare	Tacoma	August 14, 2001
CWU	MS Physical Education, Health Education, and Leisure Services	Distance Delivery	August 28, 2001
CWU	MS Engineering Technology	SeaTac	August 28, 2001

## Review of Degree Granting Institutions Act

September 2001

### Background

Under the direction of the Higher Education Coordinating Board, staff is responsible for authorizing degree-granting institutions to operate in Washington, specifying those institutions that are exempt from authorization requirements, and approving foreign degree-granting branch campuses to operate in the state.

As a part of its ongoing responsibilities, the staff will review the statute and rules pertaining to the Degree-Granting Institutions Act.

This document contains a brief summary of the act and rules relating to authorization, and exemption from authorization, together with an outline of a proposed process to conduct the review.

### Degree-Granting Institutions Act

The Washington Legislature enacted the Degree-Granting Institutions Act, chapter 28B.85 RCW, in 1986. The Board subsequently adopted rules to carry out the provisions of the act.

The act establishes a requirement that degree-granting institutions operating in Washington obtain authorization from the Higher Education Coordinating Board, unless specifically exempted from the authorization requirement of the act. The Board adopted rules (WAC 250-61) as a supplement to the act to establish necessary regulations for the authorization of degree-granting institutions.

The purpose of the act is to ensure fair business practices and adequate quality among degree-granting institutions operating in Washington and to protect citizens against substandard, fraudulent, and deceptive practices.

The act applies to degree programs and academic credit courses offered within the state. The act does not apply to degree programs and academic credit courses offered exclusively from outside the state through individual and private communication.

A degree-granting institution shall not operate, conduct business, grant or offer to grant any courses or degree programs unless the institution has obtained authorization from the Board or has been determined by the Board to be exempt.

## REQUIREMENTS OF THE ACT

The act requires the Board to establish minimum standards for degree-granting institutions. These standards include granting of degrees, quality of education, unfair business practices, financial stability and other necessary measures to protect the citizens of Washington against substandard, fraudulent, or deceptive practices.

Currently the minimum standards are defined in rules adopted by the Board . The citizens of the state are protected from substandard, fraudulent, or deceptive practices through careful review of the institution's:

- bylaws and regulations established for governance and operation;
- administrator qualifications;
- admission requirements;
- student services;
- provisions for maintaining academic and financial records;
- facilities;
- fees and other charges;
- statements of transferability of credits;
- publications, including catalogs and handbooks; and
- biennial reviews and renewals of authorization.

Quality of education is determined by review of:

- curriculum;
- faculty qualifications;
- credit requirements;
- library resources; and
- institutional provisions for continual evaluation of educational programs.

Financial stability is demonstrated by a review of:

- bank or other financial institution references;
- a financial statement showing adequate financial resources; and
- a proposed two-year budget.

Unfair business practices are protected against through a review of:

- enrollment contracts;
- cancellation and refund policies; and
- advertisements.

The act further directs the Board to investigate any entity believed to be subject to the jurisdiction of the act and to develop an interagency agreement with the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to regulate private vocational schools with respect to degree and non-degree programs. Both boards have entered into such an agreement.



The act requires degree-granting institutions to be authorized before offering or granting degrees in Washington. An institution may not operate in Washington unless it is authorized. By rule, the Board has defined “to operate” to include:

- offering courses in person, by correspondence, or electronic media, at any Washington location for degree credit, including electronic courses transmitted into the state of Washington;
- maintaining or advertising a Washington location, mailing address, or telephone number for any purpose or any function of a degree-granting institution, other than contact with the institution’s former students; and
- to advertise, publicize or engage in any activity to solicit enrollment at a degree-granting institution.

The act goes on to exempt certain institutions from the act. The exemptions pertain to:

- Any public college, university, community college, technical college, or institute operating as part of the public higher educational system;
- Institutions that have been accredited by an accrediting association recognized by the Board that meets established minimum exemption standards. Additionally, a Washington branch campus affiliated with an institution operating in another state must be separately accredited.
- Institutions of a religious character with programs devoted exclusively to religious or theological objectives. The programs must be represented in an accurate manner in institutional catalogs and other official publications.
- Institutions not otherwise exempt that offer only workshops or seminars lasting no longer than three calendar days and for which academic credit is not awarded.

The rules adopted by the Board further define exemption to include:

- Institutions offering instruction on a federal enclave solely to federal employees and their dependents.
- Tribally controlled Native American colleges.

The act empowers the Board to acquire such information from the institutions as required to carry out the act.

The remainder of the act deals with administrative direction concerning fees, surety bonds, authority to suspend or modify requirements of the act, claims, complaints, hearings, penalties for violations, educational records, contracts that could be voided, enforceability of debts, who may bring actions to enforce the chapter, and legally imposed relief.

## PROCESS FOR REVIEW

**Charge:**

Review and evaluate existing HECB policies and procedures for degree granting authorization.

**Review and Evaluate:**

Degree Authorization Act (Degree-Granting Institutions) RCW 28B.85 and WAC 250-61

Interagency Agreement adopted October 1999 between the Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board

**Proposed Schedule for Review:**

September Board meeting:

HECB staff briefing on existing policies and procedures

October Board meeting:

Present briefing paper on suggested statute and rule changes to improve the process and understanding of the policies and procedures for the degree-granting authorization act.

December Board meeting:

Present draft of proposed changes for Board comment

January and February:

Publish notice of proposed rule changes in the Washington State Register

March:

Formal hearing on proposed rule changes to be conducted

April Board meeting:

Present summary of comments received through the hearing process for Board consideration

May Board meeting:

Final Board action requested

## Guidelines for Higher Education Accountability Plans

September 2001

### Executive Summary

As the state moves into the third biennium of an accountability system with goals and performance measures, it is critical to monitor the impact of these initiatives on students. The guidelines for the 2001-03 Biennium offer institutions the flexibility to develop strategies to address the needs of particular groups of students and to propose challenging targets on the performance measures mandated by the Legislature.

Authority for these guidelines is contained in the Operating Budget for the 2001-2003 Biennium (*Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6153, Section 601*):

*“Each institution receiving appropriations under sections 604 through 609 of this act shall submit a biennial plan to achieve measurable and specific improvement each academic year as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of long-term performance goal. The plans, to be prepared at the direction of the higher education coordinating board, shall be submitted by August 15, 2001. The higher education coordinating board shall set biennial performance targets for each institution and shall review actual achievements annually. Institutions shall track their actual performance on the statewide measures as well as faculty productivity, the goals and targets for which may be unique to each institution. A report on progress toward statewide and institution-specific goals, with recommendations for the ensuing biennium, shall be submitted to the fiscal and higher education committees of the legislature by November 15, 2003.”*

Due to the short time between the effective date of the operating budget and the due date for the institutions' plans, agency staff requested and received an extension of the deadline for submission of the plans to October 10, 2001.

These guidelines set the framework for the Accountability Plans due October 10, from each of Washington's six public baccalaureate institutions. After receiving and reviewing these accountability plans, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) at its October 30 meeting, will set biennial intermediate performance targets for each institution for each of the four statewide accountability measures.

### 2001-2003 Accountability Plans

The accountability plans should be divided into two parts:

#### ***Part I. Strategies Implemented in 1999-2001***

This section should summarize each institution's experience during the previous biennium through a brief description of the strategies used to affect the performance measures. These descriptions should provide the context needed to understand the strategies and targets proposed for the 2001-03 Biennium.

***Part II. Baselines, Measures, Targets, and Strategies***

This section should set baselines for institutional performance on both the statewide and institution-specific measures, propose challenging intermediate targets on all of the performance measures, and discuss institutional strategies for moving toward these targets and the statewide goals in the 2001-2003 Biennium.

1. **Baseline:** The baseline from which to assess “*measurable and specific improvement*” should be calculated on the basis of *the average of fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999.*
2. **Statewide performance measures:** The 2001-03 Appropriations Act maintained the statewide performance measures set in 1997. It also specified faculty productivity as an additional performance measure and indicated that institutions may set their own measures of and targets for faculty productivity. Institutions should continue the measures of faculty productivity used in their 1999-01 accountability plans or, where appropriate, refine those measures. The HECB expects that institutions will provide compelling reasons for changing their faculty productivity measures.
3. **Institution-specific measures:** As part of their “continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress,” institutions should continue to use and, where appropriate, refine the institution-specific measures of performance used in their 1999-01 accountability plans. The HECB expects that institutions will provide compelling reasons for changing their institution-specific performance measures.
4. **Statewide goals:** Institutions’ plans should continue to strive toward these performance goals:

<i>Accountability measure</i>	<i>Long-term performance goal:</i>
a. Undergraduate graduation efficiency index	
For students beginning as freshmen	95%
For transfer students	90%
b. Undergraduate student retention:	
Research universities	95%
Other public four-year institutions	90%
c. Five-year graduation rate	
Research universities	65%
Other public four-year institutions	55%
d. Faculty productivity	Institution-specific
e. Optional institution-specific measures	Institution-specific

5. **Intermediate targets and measurable and specific improvement:** Each institution shall propose challenging intermediate targets on all of the performance measures, and may introduce targets to address improvements in performance measures for particular groups of students (e.g., retention of freshmen). Institutions shall report annually on their progress toward these targets and progress toward the statewide performance goals.
6. **Strategies for the 2001-2003 Biennium:** Each institution should describe initiatives for the current biennium aimed at improving institutional performance on the statewide and institution-specific measures.
7. **HECB approval:** Staff will review institutions' proposed plans and work with institutions to resolve any questions. Plans should go forward to the Board for approval at the October 30, 2001 meeting.
8. **Annual report:** Annual reports to the Board describing achievement of the performance targets are due November 1 of each year. The reports should present the data and analyze the effect of the strategies implemented to date – what worked and didn't work, and why.

**RESOLUTION NO. 01-30**

WHEREAS, The Washington Legislature required institutions to prepare accountability plans at the direction of the Higher Education Coordinating Board and submit them to the Board by August 15, 2001; and

WHEREAS, The institutions have been granted an extension of this deadline to October 10; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has prepared guidelines to help the institutions prepare accountability plans that will describe each institution's strategies for making meaningful and substantial progress toward the achievement of the Legislature's long-term performance goals;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts these guidelines for the 2001-2003 Accountability Plans; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board encourages institutions to identify student learning outcomes in all undergraduate academic programs, develop assessment projects in the areas of writing, quantitative skills, and technological literacy, and to report annually on their progress in those areas.

Adopted:

September 12, 2001

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kristianne Blake, Secretary

## Teacher-Training Pilot Program Grants

September 2001

### BACKGROUND

RCW 28B.80.620 authorizes the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to administer a competitive grant program to expand or create collaborative teacher-training and recruitment programs through Washington public high schools, community colleges, and four-year institutions. The 2001-03 state operating budget includes a total of \$300,000 for competitive grants to support the teacher-training pilot program.

For the 1999-2001 Biennium, the HECB approved two proposals:

- Western Washington University, Everett Community College, Skagit Valley Community College, Whatcom Community College Teacher-Training Pilot Program in Collaboration with Bellingham, Blaine, Everett, and Sedro-Woolley School Districts – \$149,966 for the 1999-2001 Biennium. This proposal focused on developing a coordinated approach to training teachers for the K-12 system.
- University of Washington Bothell, Teacher-Training Pilot Program, in Collaboration with Cascadia Community College District and Northshore and Lake Washington School Districts – \$144,698 for the 1999-2001 Biennium. This proposal focused on establishing a teacher-training program that combines early identification of prospective teachers at the high schools, preparatory experiences at the community college, and culminating course work and field experiences at the university.

Later this year, HECB staff will present a report on the outcomes of these initial pilot programs.

For the 2001-03 Biennium, the HECB issued a request for proposals (RFP) that solicited new pilot projects and invited the 1999-2001 grant recipients to apply for up to \$25,000 during FY 2002 to enable these institutions to complete their work in the new programs.

### GRANT PROPOSAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS

In July 1999, the HECB adopted *Resolution 99-27*, which outlined the process to review and approve proposals for the teacher-training pilot program grant. In accordance with *Resolution No. 99-27*:

- HECB staff distributed the RFP for the Teacher-Training Pilot Program on July 17, 2001, to the public two-and-four-year colleges and universities. The RFP also was distributed to the independent baccalaureate institutions, because a public institution could invite them to be a partner in the teacher-training pilot program.

- By August 24, six proposals arrived — one from a community college and five from the public four-year institutions. Washington State University did not submit a proposal. WSU is working with a multi-million dollar federal teacher-training grant.
- On September 5, a review committee of representatives from K-12 and two- and four-year institutions, the private baccalaureate institutions and HECB staff reviewed and ranked the proposals. Organizations represented on the review committee included the state Professional Educator Standards Board, the state Community and Technical College system, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board for Education.

## REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Of the six proposals received, the review committee recommends funding three proposals, described below.

- **University of Washington, Bothell Teacher-Training Pilot Program Extension: The Teaching Link in Collaboration with Cascadia Community College District -- \$20,000 for FY 2002.**

This proposal focuses on creating additional pathways from local high school teaching academies through local community colleges into the UW Bothell Education Minor and Teacher Certification Program.

Three outcomes are expected as a result of this project:

1. Follow-up with students who completed the Cascadia education courses to determine how those courses have influenced their interests in teaching;
2. Establish teacher preparation program articulation agreements with Shoreline and Bellevue Community College; and
3. Develop additional contacts with high school teaching academies.

- **Green River Community College Teacher-Training Pilot Program: Project LINK – Linking the EALRs to Their Related Content Course in Teacher Preparation – in Collaboration with Project TEACH Partner Schools and Colleges -- \$141,481 for the 2001-2003 Biennium.**

This proposal focuses on creating a model teacher preparation program for two-year college students. In this program, prospective teachers gain knowledge of and experience with Washington's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) in humanities, social sciences and wellness.



Five outcomes are expected as a result of this project:

1. Provide exposure to all of the EALR areas to pre-service teachers in their first two years of college;
2. Create learning modules for future teachers that allow them to explore the EALRs while taking content courses;
3. Help all college instructors understand the specific needs of prospective teachers and their need to be familiar with the EALRs early in their education;
4. Create a campus-wide Teacher Preparation Advisory Committee that will serve as a long-term planning and implementation body for teacher preparation; and
5. Create a model that any community college or four-year institution could use to help future teachers explore the EALRs while taking general education courses.

- **Western Washington University Teacher-Training Pilot Program: Pathways to Careers in Teaching Phase II in Collaboration with Everett, Whatcom, and Skagit Valley Community Colleges – \$138,519**

This proposal focuses on three areas: development and articulation of programs and courses in subject areas where teacher shortages exist, such as math, science, and special education; distribution of information about teacher preparation programs to a diverse group of prospective students; and integration of the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) into general college requirement courses.

Four outcomes are expected as a result of this project:

1. Reduced time-to-degree at the baccalaureate institution for students transferring from community colleges;
2. Design of at least two lower-division courses thematically linked to the state student learning goals and essential learning requirements;
3. Articulation of a course for high school students interested in teaching careers between high school and community college partners; and
4. Establishment of effective student recruitment and advising systems with a focus on students of color.

The review committee recommendations to the HECB are embodied in *Resolution No. 01-31*, which appears below.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Following the HECB's approval action, interagency agreements between the HECB and the institutional grant recipients will be written, outlining the terms under which the grants are provided, including details such as assessment and reporting requirements. The HECB executive director and the chief financial officers at the grant-receiving institutions will sign these agreements.

The first-year grant funds for the teacher education pilot programs will become available as soon as the interagency agreements are signed. Second-year grant funds will become available as soon as possible after July 1, 2002.

HECB staff will contact all of the institutions that applied for teacher-training pilot program grants to discuss the rationale for the review committee's recommendations and the HECB's decisions.

**RESOLUTION NO. 01-31**

WHEREAS, The Governor and the Legislature have appropriated \$300,000 for the 2001-2003 Biennium to the Higher Education Coordinating Board for competitive grants to develop coordinated, innovative programs of teacher training; and

WHEREAS, The Board, via *Resolution 99-27*, adopted a process for review and approval of the teacher-education pilot program grant proposals; and

WHEREAS, The Board staff and external experts in the field have evaluated the 2001-2003 grant proposals in accordance with the adopted process, and recommend funding the following teacher-education pilot programs:

1. University of Washington, Bothell Teacher-Training Pilot Program extension: The Teaching Link in Collaboration with Cascadia Community College District;
2. Green River Community College Teacher-Training Pilot Program: Project Link – Linking the EALRs to Their Related Content Course in Teacher Preparation – in Collaboration with Project Teach Partner Schools and Colleges; and
3. Western Washington University Teacher-Training Pilot Program: Pathways to Careers in Teaching Phase II in Collaboration with Everett, Whatcom, and Skagit Valley Community Colleges.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington, Bothell teacher-training pilot program extension in the amount of \$20,000 for FY 2002; the Green River Community College teacher-training pilot program in the amount of \$141,481 for the 2001-2003 Biennium; and the Western Washington University teacher-training pilot program in the amount of \$138,519 for the 2001-2003 Biennium.

Adopted:

September 12, 2001

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kristianne Blake, Secretary

## State Need Grant Update

September 2001

### Executive Summary

#### Background

The State Need Grant (SNG) is Washington's largest state-appropriated program of student financial aid. Since its inception in 1969, the program has helped make it possible for hundreds of thousands of low-income or disadvantaged Washington residents to continue their education beyond high school.

During the 2000-2001 academic year, about 53,500 students received approximately \$87 million in State Need Grant funds to attend one of 73 participating institutions. Grants were awarded to students who had family incomes up to 65 percent of the state's median family income – about \$37,500 for a family of four.<sup>1</sup>

Student Eligibility. To receive a grant, a student must be a Washington resident, meet the specified “need” criteria; and enroll at least half time in an eligible program at a participating college. Recipients must maintain satisfactory progress toward program or degree completion, and they may not receive a grant for study beyond the time limits established in state law.

The enabling legislation for the State Need Grant program directs that recipients be selected on the basis of their financial need, compared to all students statewide. Funding is to follow eligible students to their choice of institution. Recipients may attend a public community or technical college, a public or independent college or university, or a participating accredited private vocational (proprietary) school.

Program Administration. The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) administers the State Need Grant program, ensuring that the program supplements and complements other available federal, state, and institutional financial aid programs to the extent appropriate. The Board develops rules for program administration, establishes the income cutoff for eligibility, sets grant amounts, allocates funds among institutions in proportion to the amount each is estimated to need to award eligible students, and administers the centralized aspects of the program. The Board monitors utilization throughout the academic year, making adjustments in student eligibility, grant amounts, and/or institutional allocations as necessary to ensure that funds are awarded to as many eligible students as possible.

Institutions determine which of their financial aid applicants qualify for the grant, include it as a part of the student's total financial aid award, and monitor continuing eligibility. They track and reconcile institutional utilization of State Need Grant funds allocated to their institution.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for a program overview and summary.

The combination of statewide policy and local awarding of eligible students ensures the program achieves statewide policy goals, that low income students across the state are treated equitably, and that the state's investment in this program is maximized.

Policy and Procedure Reviews. Since the program's inception, the Board (and its predecessor agencies) has periodically reviewed and amended State Need Grant policies. The program has been modified in response to legislative directives, changes in federal student financial aid policies, and as a result of the Board's own review and assessment.

HECB staff, with the assistance of financial aid administrator advisory groups, have regularly reviewed administrative procedures and modified them, as appropriate. Changes in program administration have been made to reflect policy changes and to ensure that operating procedures are as efficient and effective as possible in achieving program goals.

### **Current Administrative Review**

The Board completed its most recent State Need Grant policy review in 1998. The recommendations that resulted from that study were subsequently adopted by the Legislature during its 1999 session. A re-examination of State Need Grant program administrative practices is presently under way. The primary focus of the current review is on procedures to improve the process used by the Board to allocate SNG funds to institutions for distribution to eligible students.

Interest in the Board's allocation model became elevated this past year, when, after a 30-year history of essentially full use of all appropriated funds, the 1999-2000 academic year ended with \$4 million (or 5 percent of the appropriation) unspent. Much of the underutilization can be attributed to fewer-than-expected numbers of low income students enrolling due to continued implementation of Work First regulations, a robust job market, and implementation of SNG policy changes that reduced grant eligibility. The problem was compounded by institutions' reticence to release unspent State Need Grant funds for use at other colleges, based on their expectation that additional numbers of eligible students would enroll later in the academic year. Ultimately, many institutions released unused funds for redistribution at the end of the fiscal year – too late for the funds to be awarded to eligible students at other institutions – and the State Need Grant allocation was not fully spent.

Further questions about the distribution model used by the Board to allocate State Need Grant funds were raised when, during the 2000-2001 academic year, funds were fully expended, but not all institutions were able award all eligible students up to the same income level.

These recent experiences have led to a re-examination of the model used to determine the allocation of State Need Grant funds among participating institutions, as well as consideration of ways in which institutional reporting could be improved to ensure that, when necessary, funds are redistributed to the maximum benefit of the state's needy students.

HECB staff has convened a work group to address these issues. The work group includes financial aid directors from each sector, along with representatives of the Washington Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Council of Presidents, and the Washington Federation of Private Career Schools and Colleges. Staff from the Senate and House higher education and fiscal committees are also invited to participate in work group meetings. Work group meeting notes are circulated to all financial aid administrators and other interested people for further comments and suggestions.

The work group is considering several important aspects of program administration, focusing primarily on ways to improve State Need Grant fund distribution and utilization. For example:

- How can State Need Grant allocation decisions be improved to forecast, with the greatest possible certainty, the eligibility and enrollment patterns of recipients for the upcoming year? The goal of this effort is to ensure that students across the state have a reasonably similar opportunity to receive a grant, regardless of the school or sector they attend.
- How can the HECB best provide information about the income cut-off for grant eligibility and award amounts early in the spring, before institutions offer financial aid awards to students? And, how can the allocation process be designed to minimize the need to adjust grant amounts or student eligibility criteria once institutions have made awards to students?
- What modifications in institutional reporting are needed to support earlier and more accurate estimates of the attendance patterns of Need Grant-eligible students, and to determine if mid-year adjustments are necessary due to unanticipated changes in student enrollment?

The work group has met three times to date, and has made excellent progress in addressing these issues. New procedures are under development that respond to both HECB and the institutions' needs. The changes that result from the current administrative review will be implemented this fall. Staff and members of the work group are optimistic that the modifications which result from this review will further improve program administration for the Board and for participating institutions.

**State Need Grant Program  
Overview and Summary  
2000-2001 and 2001-2002 Academic Years**

♦ **Target Population: Washington's Lowest Income Students**

- Students who have financial need based on federal need analysis are served in rank order of income, up to the amount of available funds.
- "Income" is described as a percent of the state's median family income.
- The Higher Education Coordinating Board has established that first priority be given to eligible low-income, undergraduate students with a family income at or below 65 percent of the state's median family income.

♦ **Statewide-Consistent Eligibility Criteria and Grant Amounts; Institutional Awarding and Administration**

- Student eligibility is the same at all participating institutions.
- Grant amounts are standardized within each institutional type.
- Students of similar circumstances are assured of eligibility, regardless of where they attend school.
- Institutions determine student eligibility, incorporate the grant into the student's financial aid package, and monitor continuing eligibility.

This combination – statewide-consistent eligibility and local administration – provides equity and maximizes efficiency.

♦ **Coordination with Federal Programs**

- Program policies and administrative procedures are coordinated, to the extent practical, with federal policies and procedures.

♦ **Student Eligibility Criteria**

For a student to receive a State Need Grant, he or she must:

- Be a Washington resident.
- Be an undergraduate.
- Meet the specified "need" criteria.
- Be eligible for federal need-based financial aid.
- Enroll at least half-time in an eligible program at a school that has been approved to participate.
- Maintain satisfactory progress toward program or degree completion.
- Not be in repayment status on a federal or state grant or in default on a student loan.
- Not have exceeded maximum program or lifetime eligibility limits.

## State Need Grant Program Overview and Summary

### ♦ Quick Program Facts

	<u><b>2000-2001</b></u>	<u><b>2001-2002</b></u>
<b>FUNDING LEVEL</b>	\$87 Million	\$90 Million
<b>EST. NUMBER OF RECIPIENTS</b>	52,750	TBD
<b>PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS</b>	73	72
<b>INCOME CUTOFF</b>	65% State Median Family Income (MFI)	55% State Median Family Income (MFI)
Family Size 1	\$19,500	\$17,500
Family Size 2	\$25,500	\$23,000
Family Size 3	\$31,500	\$28,000
Family Size 4	\$37,500	\$33,500
<b>GRANT AMOUNTS</b>		
Community/Tech. College	\$1,638	\$1,740
Private Career College	\$1,638	\$1,740
Public Comprehensive Univ.	\$2,538	\$2,730
Public Research Univ.	\$3,114	\$3,360
Independent College/Univ.	\$3,352	\$3,594
Dependent Care Allowance (DCA)	\$ 600	\$ 618



# 2000-2001 STATE NEED GRANT EXPENDITURES

Funds available for grants including Federal LEAP Funds			\$ <u>86,744,471</u>
		Undup Head- count	2000-01 Expended
1010	University of Washington	5,185	\$ 13,649,129 *
1020	Washington State University	3,652	9,150,681
2030	Central Washington University	2,092	4,350,080 *
2040	Eastern Washington University	2,286	4,919,832
2050	The Evergreen State College	971	2,046,620 *
2060	Western Washington University	2,465	4,847,983 *
2080	North Idaho College	5	7,752
2070	Portland State University	34	71,048
3090	Bastyr University	52	131,982
3100	Cornish Institute	123	359,088
3110	Heritage College	364	872,472
3120	Gonzaga University	372	969,284
3280	Henry Cogswell	8	29,330
3130	Northwest College-Kirkland	134	368,478
3240	Northwest College of Art-Poulsbo	12	18,757
3140	Pacific Lutheran University	530	1,472,650
3150	Saint Martin's College	233	568,342
3160	Seattle Pacific University	292	801,717
3170	Seattle University	482	1,336,938
3190	University of Puget Sound	122	350,721
3200	Walla Walla College	178	486,733
3210	Whitman College	48	143,298
3220	Whitworth College	252	611,238
4300	Bellevue Community College	955	1,131,786
4310	Big Bend Community College	421	578,524
4580	Cascadia Community College	105	120,000
4320	Centralia College		615,667 *
4330	Clark College	1,510	1,533,196
4340	Columbia Basin College	953	1,066,613
4350	Edmonds Community College	853	1,125,393 *
4360	Everett Community College	755	889,291
4370	Pierce College	1,273	1,516,867
4380	Grays Harbor College	709	818,987
4390	Green River Community College	668	653,369

4400	Highline Community College	1,047	1,362,333
4410	Lower Columbia College	892	948,950 *
4420	South Puget Sound Community	917	1,038,558
4430	Olympic College	1,000	1,221,897
4440	Peninsula College	526	610,993 *
4450	Seattle Central Community College	1,323	1,496,699 *
4460	North Seattle Community College	658	758,911
4470	South Seattle Community College	509	621,655
4480	Shoreline Community College	772	900,814 *
4490	Skagit Valley College	796	932,151 *
4500	Spokane Community College	2,889	3,656,534
4510	Spokane Falls Community College	2,317	2,832,465
4520	Tacoma Community College	1,533	1,528,338 *
4530	Walla Walla Community College	649	878,896 *
4540	Wenatchee Valley College	854	1,034,847 *
4550	Whatcom Community College	904	962,406 *
4560	Yakima Valley College	1,320	1,543,735
4570	Northwest Indian College	206	192,802
5700	Bates Technical College	627	779,182
5710	Bellingham Technical College	282	302,335
5720	Clover Park Technical College	950	1,086,004
5730	Lake Washington Technical College	433	498,300
5740	Renton Technical College	384	420,597
5750	Seattle Vocational Institute	15	112,339 *
6700	*ITT Technical Institute - Seattle	235	289,767
6710	*ITT Technical Institute - Spokane	295	348,173
6730	*Business Computer Training Institute	907	1,049,213
6740	*Divers Institute of Technology	10	17,988
6750	*International Air Academy	58	59,953
6760	*Interface Computer School	141	165,942
6770	*Crown College	54	51,727
6780	*Gene Juarez Academy	112	149,165
6810	*Bryman College	212	223,431
6820	*Art Institute of Seattle	420	516,462
6840	*Perry Technical Institute	154	204,057
6850	*Court Reporting Institute	106	140,572
6870	*Ashmead College	26	28,968
6890	*Clare's Beauty College	49	73,545
6970	*Glen Dow Academy	75	89,923
Total		<u>52,751</u>	\$ <u>86,744,471</u>

\* As of August 28, 2001 - not verified

## K-16 Roundtable

September 2001

### Background

#### I. What is K-16?

K-16 refers to a national movement to provide seamless education from kindergarten, or earlier, through college. The goal is to create an educational system that promotes access, standards, accountability and lifelong learning in a thoughtful, deliberate, and coordinated manner. Issues that cross traditional educational boundaries include: (a) the relationship between high school graduation and college entrance requirements; (b) the development of high school college preparation classes; (c) the work of education departments to prepare teachers to teach to established K-12 essential learning requirements; (d) improving college readiness to reduce remediation costs and to help ensure student success in college, etc. There are many other examples of K-16 efforts.

A number of national organizations are addressing K-16 issues, including: the National Governors Association (NGA), the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), the Education Commission of the States (ECS), and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO).

#### II. The Importance of K-16: What role can we play?

Increasing student performance and expanding access to higher education are fundamental goals for the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). And linking K-12 achievement to higher education opportunity is one of five key goals adopted in the “2000 Master Plan for Higher Education.” By sponsoring a K-16 roundtable, the HECB has an opportunity to bring together key policy makers to help develop a systemic framework for viewing our disparate K-16 efforts.

#### III. What are we doing to address our K-16 concerns?

Last spring, the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) organization invited us to participate in a new SHEEO initiative called “Building Statewide K-16 Systems for Student Success.” SHEEO, in turn, has partnered with both the Education Commission of the States (ECS) and the “Pathways to College Network” to support these roundtable efforts. There are no strict guidelines directing the roundtables; in fact, we have been encouraged to tailor our roundtable to meet the unique interests and needs of our state. One of the tasks we will have completed before the roundtable convenes is an inventory of K-16 efforts under way in Washington.

## **Washington State University Presentation**

September 2001

President V. Lane Rawlins will present this item. The title of his presentation is, “World Class. Face to Face. How Washington State University is using strategic planning and budgeting to reposition itself and meet new challenges facing the state.”